

**Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking  
MB Docket No. 04-233**

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

**General comments regarding EMF Broadcasting, KLOVE Radio Network and AIR1 Radio Network:**

EMF Broadcasting has been serving the public interest since its inception and continues to do so on a daily basis. The programming on these networks is indeed targeted to the general public and meets needs of local areas in the form of public events, local and nation-wide news, and emergency information. Our local KLOVE station provides our family with a source of enriching programming meaningful to a young family trying to raise children in a world where bullets are causing disaster in schools on frequent occasion.

EMF Broadcast offers a moral and ethical foundation to an age where both are contested on the streets and in every other mainstream media. As a parent, and concerned citizen, it is relieving to not have to worry about what my children will hear and repeat as a consequence of listening to a Christian radio station. This same is not true for many other media types.

I urge the commission to pass laws which would allow the continuance of efficient licensing and means for cost effective broadcasting for EMF Broadcasting and other similar entities

**Specific comments regarding the aforementioned NPRM:**

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

(6) Understanding the need for increased public involvement and hence allowance for few restrictions to LPFM stations, many Christian broadcasters employ Translator stations in order to further their coverage area and their intended audience. The FCC must not adopt rules which would counter the use of the Translator stations to the public interest and demand, specifically for existing services but not excluding new translator stations in favor of LPFM.

I urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

\_\_\_\_Randal Clark\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Randal Clark  
7111 Hites Cove Rd.  
Mariposa CA 95338

\_\_\_\_April 15, 2008\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_209-742-2072\_\_\_\_  
Phone